

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Objection to Claim 3

Claim 3 has been re-written in independent form to include the limitations of original claims 1 and 2, from which it depended, in accordance with the indication of allowable subject matter in item 8 on page 8 of the Official Action.

2. Rejection of Claims 1-2, and 4 Under 35 USC §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,696,213 (Conneally) or Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of the Connealy Patent and U.S. Patent No. 2,806,493 (Gaskell)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that neither the Conneally patent nor the Gaskell patent discloses or suggests, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, the following features of the claimed invention:

- the roller contacts an **upper** surface of a first rail;
- the second end of the rip guide is slidably engaged with the **lower** surface of the second rail.

As a result of this positively claimed structure, the rip guide can easily be installed by hooking the second end under the second rail while simply placing the first end onto the first rail. Even more importantly, the rip guide can also easily be removed by lifting up on the first end and unhooking the second end. It is very important that the rip guide be removable or the table saw cannot be used for cutting larger sheets of material.

In the arrangement of Connealy, as best shown in Figs. 3 and 6, spring clip 22 engages the underside of a rail 14, but the roller 20 does not engage an upper surface of rail 12. Instead, the double roller of Connealy engages an edge of the roller, with a portion of the roller extending under the rail, making removal and installation of the rip guide relatively difficult since removal entails first unhooking the spring clip 22 and then lifting the second end while moving the entire

rip guide laterally to disengage roller 20 from rail 12.. The Gaskell patent does not make up for the deficiencies of the Connealy since it does not disclose or suggest any roller structure.

Because the Connealy and Gaskell patents neither disclose nor suggest a roller that engages the **upper** surface of the rail, as claimed, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 1, 2, and 4 under 35 USC §102 and 103 are improper and should be withdrawn.

3. Rejection of Claims 5 and 6 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 4,696,213 (Conneally), 2,806,493 (Gaskell), and 6,360,641 (Talesky)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that neither the Talesky patent, like the Connealy and Gaskell patents, fails to disclose or suggest the claimed rip guide having at least one roller that contacts an upper surface of a first rail, the second end of the rip guide engaging a lower surface of a second rail, as recited in claim 1. While the rip guide of Talesky includes a roller, the roller is at an end opposite the handle, rather than at the first end, as claimed.

4. Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 USC §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,808,-84 (Eschenburg) or Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of the Eschenburg Patent and U.S. Patent No. 2,806,493 (Gaskell)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Eschenburg patent fails to disclose a rip guide having one roller that contacts an **upper** surface of a first rail, and a second end that engages with a **lower** surface of the second rail. Instead, the rip guide of Eschenburg has rollers on both sides that simply rest against lateral surfaces of the rails, with no hooking effect and therefore a less stable engagement between the rip guide and the table. As indicated above, the Gaskell patent does not disclose any sort of roller arrangement.

5. Rejection of Claims 5 and 6 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 4,696,213 (Eschenburg), 2,806,493 (Gaskell), and 6,360,641 (Talesky)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the roller disclosed in the Talesky patent is at an opposite end of the handle from that of the claimed invention, and

therefore the Talesky patent does not make up for the deficiencies of the Eschenburg and Gaskell patents. In particular, the Talesky patent fails to suggest modification of the roller arrangement of Eschenburg to cause the roller at the handle end to contact an upper surface of a first rail, and the roller at the second end to engage a lower surface of a second rail, as recited in claim 1, from which claims 5 and 6 depend.

6. Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 4,696,213 (Eschenburg), 2,806,493 (Gaskell), and 4,696,213 (Conneally)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that, for the reasons stated above, neither the Eschenburg patent, the Gaskell patent, nor the Conneally patent discloses or suggests the claimed *combination* of a rip guide roller that engages an upper side of a first rail and a second end that engages a lower side of the second rail.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: April 18, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500